## Fiscal Estimate - 2009 Session

Original Updated	Corrected Supplemental					
LRB Number <b>09-3857/1</b>	Introduction Number SB-496					
<b>Description</b> Possession of dogs by certain felony offenders and providing a penalty						
Fiscal Effect						
Appropriations  Decrease Existing Appropriations Reverse Appropriations Create New Appropriations  Local:  No Local Government Costs Indeterminate  1. Increase Costs Permissive Mandatory Perm	Counties Uthers					
Permissive Mandatory Permissive Mandatory Districts  Districts						
Fund Sources Affected Affected Ch. 20 Appropriations  GPR FED PRO PRS SEG SEGS						
Agency/Prepared By	Authorized Signature Date					
SPD/ Megan Christiansen (608) 267-0311	Krista Ginger (608) 264-8572 2/2/2010					

## Fiscal Estimate Narratives SPD 2/2/2010

LRB Number	09-3857/1	Introduction Number	SB-496	Estimate Type	Original	
Description						
Possession of dogs by certain felony offenders and providing a penalty						

## **Assumptions Used in Arriving at Fiscal Estimate**

The State Public Defender (SPD) is statutorily authorized and required to appoint attorneys to represent indigent defendants in criminal and certain commitment proceedings. The SPD plays a major role in ensuring that the Wisconsin justice system complies with the right to counsel provided by both the state and federal constitutions. Any legislation has the potential to increase SPD costs if it creates a new criminal offense, expands the definition of an existing criminal offense, or increases the penalties for an existing offense.

This bill would create three new crimes: a misdemeanor prohibition of possession by certain felony offenders of a dog determined to be vicious or possession of any dog without an identification microchip; a class I felony when violation of these prohibitions result in great bodily harm or death; and a class H felony when violation of these prohibitions result in great harm or death and the person knowingly allowed the dog to run loose or failed to take steps to control the animal.

The SPD has no data to predict the number of additional misdemeanor of felony cases that would result from the changes proposed in this bill, however we assume that indigents who would qualify for SPD representation would be the least likely to afford the microchip process. The SPD's average cost to provide representation with a private bar attorney in a misdemeanor case is \$214.11, calculated on the basis of the SPD's average cost per case in fiscal year 2009. The SPD's average cost per felony appointed to private bar attorneys was \$584.62 for the same fiscal year.

Because probation or prison could be ordered upon conviction for the proposed felony crime, this change would indirectly lead to additional cases in which the Department of Corrections (DOC) would seek to revoke probation or extended supervision. Probation is also an option for misdemeanor cases; however, a felony case may result in a longer term of probation. The SPD provides representation in proceedings commenced by the Department of Corrections (DOC) to revoke supervision. Thus, the bill would indirectly increase the number of cases in which the SPD appoints attorneys in revocation proceedings. The average cost during fiscal year 2009 for SPD representation by a private bar attorney in a revocation proceeding was \$382.18.

Because of the annual caseloads for staff attorney positions specified for budgeting purposes under § 977.08(5), Stats., it would be more cost effective to add staff attorney positions if a significant number of SPD cases resulted from this provision of the bill.

Counties are also subject to increased costs when a new crime is created. There are some defendants who, despite exceeding the SPD's statutory financial guidelines, are constitutionally eligible for appointment of counsel because it would be a substantial hardship for them to retain an attorney. The court is required to appoint counsel at county expense for these defendants. Thus, the counties would experience increased costs attributable to the higher classification of criminal charges resulting from this bill. The counties could also incur additional costs associated with incarceration of defendants, both pending trial and after sentencing.

## **Long-Range Fiscal Implications**